REMARKS

Claims 1-20 stand rejected. No claims are added or canceled by amendment. Accordingly, claims 1-20 are at issue.

The Advisory Action mailed August 17, 2009 indicated that the amendment filed August 3, 2009 was not entered. The Advisory Action also indicated that the rejection under §112, second paragraph had been overcome. Accordingly, the present amendment includes amendments consistent with the previously un-entered amendment to overcome the rejection under §112, second paragraph. In this regard, claim 1 is amended to make it more clear that the axis of propagation defines the dipole axis (see, e.g., application, ¶0016). Accordingly, in the present application, the dipole axis is a direction in which electromagnetic waves radiate from the folded dipole. Claim 1 further recites that the folded dipole comprises a pair of arms which, are characterized, in part, in relation to the dipole axis. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 as presently recited more clearly defines the claimed invention.

Claim 16 was previously amended to more clearly recite that when the dipole box is viewed in plan, each pair of arms has a profile which is concave on one side and convex on the other. The phrase "plan view" has an ordinary meaning of "the appearance of an object as seen from above." Webster's Third New International Dictionary, p. 1732 (P.B. Grove, ed., 1993). Additionally, in the present application, each of Figures 14, 15, 17-30, 33 and 35 are identified in the Brief Description Of The Drawings as being a "plan view." See, Application, ¶J0086-0111. Figures 14, 15, 17-30, 33 and 35 provide a view of certain structure as seen from above, consistent with the ordinary meaning of plan view. It is respectfully submitted that "viewed in plan," given the ordinary meaning of "plan view" and when read in conjunction with the description of the drawings, is sufficiently definite to indicate a view of the plan view.

Claims 1-4 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,115,778 to Snow. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is amended to recite structure commonly understood to be associated with the term of art "a folded dipole." In this regard, claim 1 expressly recites that the folded dipole includes a fed dipole and a passive dipole having certain relationships to each other. The cited documents do not disclose the claimed folded dipole structures. For example, with regard to the present rejection concerning Snow, the portion of Snow illustrated on page 4 of the office action is not a folded dipole. For example, there is no passive dipole separated from a fed dipole by a gap and connected at the ends. Because Snow does not disclose a folded dipole as claimed in claim 1, claim 1 is not anticipated by Snow. Also, claims 2-4 and claim 9 are not anticipated by Snow for the same reason.

Claims 1-4 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,771,162 to Dienes. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The remarks set forth above with respect to the rejection based on Snow are incorporated herein by reference. The cited portions of Dienes, like Snow, fail to disclose a folded dipole as described in the claims. Instead, the only mention of a folded dipole that could be found in Dienes is an explanation that the dipole in Dienes is not a folded dipole. Dienes, col. 1, lines 58-65. Thus, claims 1-4 and 9 which claim as inventive a folded dipole are not anticipated.

Claims 1, 5-7 and 9-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,313,809 to Gabriel et al. The remarks set forth above with respect to Snow are incorporated herein by reference. The structure illustrated on page 5 of the present office action does not include any folded dipoles, as that term is defined in the claims. Accordingly, claim 1, and claims 5-7 and 9-15, which depend from claim 1, are not anticipated by Gabriel.

Independent claim 16, claims, inter alia, a dipole box comprising two or more folded dipoles. As set forth above, the portion of Gabriel relied upon in the present office action does not disclose any folded dipoles, and therefore cannot disclose two or more folded dipoles. Claim 16 is not anticipated for this reason. Also, claims 17-20 depend from claim 16, and therefore are not anticipated by Gabriel as well.

Claims 1, 5-11 and 16-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,573,874 to Saito. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The remarks set forth above with respect to Snow are incorporated by reference. Saito, like Snow, fails to disclose a folded dipole as claimed in claim 1 or two or more folded dipoles as claimed in claim 16. Accordingly, these independent claims are not anticipated by Saito. Also, claims 5-11 depend from claim 1 and 17-20 depend from claim 16, and such dependent claims are not anticipated for the same reason.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee which may be required for this application under 37 C.F.R. § § 1.16-1.18, including but not limited to the issue fee, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 23-0920.

Should no proper amount be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 23-0920.

Respectfully submitted,

HUSCH BLACKWELL SANDERS LLP
WELSH & KATZ

By _____
Walter J. Kawula, Jr.
Registration No. 39,724

November 2, 2009

HUSCH BLACKWELL SANDERS LLP
WELSH & KATZ
120 South Riverside Plaza — 22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606

Phone: (312) 655-1500
Fax: (312)655-1501